



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No.

NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS
875 THIRD AVE
18TH FLOOR
NEW YORK NY 10022

COPY MAILED

SEP 15 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Fabrizio Gavelli et al.	:	
Application No. 10/576,770	:	DECISION ON SECOND RENEWED
Filed: April 21, 2006	:	PETITION PURSUANT TO
Attorney Docket Number: 102792-	:	37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a)
572 (11348P1 US)	:	
Title: ARTICLE AND METHOD	:	

This is a decision on the second renewed petition filed September 10, 2008, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a), to revive the above-identified application.

The second renewed petition is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action, mailed May 4, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No response was received, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) were requested. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on August 5, 2007. A notice of abandonment was mailed on December 6, 2007.

Section 711.03(c)(I)(A) sets forth, *in toto*:

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice

of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v.*

Decision on Second Renewed Petition pursuant to Rule 1.137(a)

Commissioner, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(1);
- (3) A showing to the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition was unavoidable, and;
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

An original petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a) was filed on February 1, 2008, and was dismissed in the decision mailed on May 27, 2008, for failure to meet the third requirement above. The decision indicated that requirements (1) and (2) of Rule 1.137(a) had been met, and that the fourth requirement is not applicable, as no terminal disclaimer is required.

A renewed petition was filed on June 25, 2008, and was dismissed in the decision mailed on July 14, 2008. The decision indicated that the third requirement of Rule 1.137(a) had not been satisfied, due to the fact that the renewed petition was silent as to any search that might have been performed of the file jacket or the application contents.

With this second renewed petition, Petitioner has indicated that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including both the file jacket and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received.

Consequently, the third requirement of Rule 1.137(a) has been met.

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will notify the Examiner of this decision, so that the amendment and remarks that were received on February 1, 2008 can be processed in due course.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the present decision to ensure that the revival has

Decision on Second Renewed Petition pursuant to Rule 1.137(a)

been acknowledged by the Technology Center in response to this decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to any failure of that change in status should be directed to the Technology Center where that change of status must be effected - **the Office of Petitions cannot effectuate a change of status.**

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to Senior Attorney Paul Shanoski at (571) 272-3225.¹ All other inquiries concerning examination procedures should be directed to the Technology Center.

/Paul Shanoski/
Paul Shanoski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

¹ Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for any further action(s) of Petitioner.